

SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Amin and Supervisory Primary Examiner Tung for granting an in-person interview on 24 November 2008. During the interview, Applicant's representative discussed the differences between the prior art and the invention of the pending claims. Examiner Amin agreed to reconsider the rejection of the pending claims after a formal response is filed.

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on 02 October 2008 was received and reviewed. Claims 44-48 are amended. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101

A) Applicable Authority

Title 35 U.S.C. § 101 states “ [w]hoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.” A statutory process should satisfy the machine-or-transformation test, which is a two-pronged disjunctive inquiry. A process claim may be eligible for patent protection when the process is tied to a particular machine, or the process transforms an “article.” *In re Bilski*, No. 2007-1130 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 30, 2008).

B) Non-statutory Subject Matter Rejection.

Claims 44 and 45-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 44-48 are statutory subject matter.

Claims 44-48 are amended to recite a process performed as a computer-implemented method. A computer is employed to perform the actions described by the elements of claims 44-48. Claims 44-48 are not directed to any of the judicially-created exceptions. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 of amended claims 44-48.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

A) Applicable Authority

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdeggal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir.1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir.1989). *See also*, MPEP §2131. The prior art reference must also disclose those elements “arranged as in the claim.” *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Additionally, a claim is anticipated if a product was in public use or on sale more than one year prior to the filing date of the patent application. See 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

B) Anticipation Rejection Based on OS X v 10.2; release date August 24, 2002 (“Jaguar”).

Claims 1, 5-16, 19, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jaguar. Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of claims 1, 5-16, 19, and 44 because Jaguar fails to describe all elements of amended independent claims 1 and 44.

Applicant requests that the Office clarify whether the current rejection is based on a “printed subject matter” bar, a “public use” bar, or an “on sale” bar to patentability. Applicant assumes that the current rejection is based on printed subject matter and not “public use” activities or “on sale” activities. Because the current rejection is not clear regarding the reasons (“printed subject matter,” “public use,” or “on sale”) for anticipation, Applicant has assumed that the rejection is based on “printed subject matter.”

The following is a listing of the “prior art” printed subject matter relied on by the Office to maintain a 102(b) printed subject matter rejection of claims 1, 5-16, 19, and 44:

1. David Morgenstern, *Under the Desktop: Prospecting for Quartz in Mac OS X*, pp 1-4, Aug. 22, 2002 (“Morgenstern”);
2. Apple, *Apple Introduces Jaguar, the Next Major Release of Mac OS X*, pp. 1-3, Jul. 17, 2002 (“Apple”);
3. Moki, *Aqua help in Nvidia GeoForce 4*, AppleInsider Web Archive, p. 1, Jan. 28, 2002 (“Moki”);
4. John Siracusa, *MAC OS X 10.2*, Arstehnica Website, pp. 1-5, Sept. 5, 2002 (“Siracusa”);
5. Shawn Erickson, *ScreenShot*, OmniGroup Website, p. 1, Jul. 30, 2002 (“Erickson”);
6. Torrey Lyons, *Re: MacOS X*, Xfree86 Website, p.1 Jul. 9, 2003 (“Lyons”);
7. Roussel, *Ametista: a mini-toolkit for exploring new window management techniques*, p. 1 Aug. 2003 (“Roussel”);
8. Portuesi, *Displaying In-Memory Video Using OpenGL*, Lukertech Website, p. 1, Oct. 16, 2002 (“Portuesi”);
9. Lindberg, *2D Graphics Using Quartz*, OOPS Website, p. 1 May 22, 2001. (“Lindberg”);
10. Lipton, *QuickDraw GX for Postscript Programmers*, Mactech Website, p. 1, Aug. 19, 2000 (“Lipton”); and
11. Apple Computers, *About the Mac Os X Printing System*, p. 1, Dec. 11, 2002 (“Apple Computers”).

Applicant respectfully notes these citations do not refer to single release or configuration of the “Jaguar” operating environment. In *Epstein*, the Federal Circuit sustained a 102(b) rejection based on multiple references. There, the Federal Circuit reviewed each reference to support a “public use” and “on sale” bar to patentability. *In re Epstein*, 32 F.39 1559, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1994). The Federal circuit noted that each abstract describes the features relied on by the examiner. *Id.*

Here, the references do not refer to a single release of Jaguar. The references do not each describe the features relied on by the examiner. Some references describe older versions of the operating system. Some references describe the new operating system and the shortfalls of its graphical processing requirements. Some references describe a printing subsystem. Each of the references relied on by the Office fails to describe the elements of the invention of claims 1, 5-16, 19, and 44. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection for claims 1, 5-16, 19, and 44.

Independent claim 1 is a method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A composting desktop window manager (CDWM) receives application content from advanced applications in a bottom-to-top order to display the application content received in a bottom-to-top order in windows corresponding to the advanced applications in the graphical user interface. A desktop window manager (DWM) receives application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in windows corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface. Application content received from the legacy applications are stripped and converted to a graphical representation. The operating system switches between the CDWM and the DWM to render the advanced application content and legacy application content

and displays at least a portion of the application content in an opaque content portion of the windows, where the windows have translucent frame portions.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to describe, among other things, *receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in a window corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation; switching between the CDWM and the DWM to render the advanced application content and legacy application content;* as recited in independent claim 1. The Office relies upon Jaguar as described in the 11 references to anticipate the invention of claim 1.

The cited portions of the 11 references describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment.

Apple Computers describes a print system for printing documents to a printer. Apple Computers describes configuring the page layout of a document to be left-right then top-bottom. Apple Computers fails to describe rendering a window associated with legacy applications and advanced applications in a graphical user interface.

Lipton describes a legacy API. Lipton does not describe receiving legacy application content and rendering that content. At best, Lipton describes a y-axis orientation for the legacy API. Lipton fails to describe receiving the legacy application content in top-to-bottom order.

Erickson describes a hypothetical situation, posited by Dietmar Planitzer, having two windows: one for pictures and one for text. The hypothetical is then corrected by Jack

Shedd, who notes that the Core Graphics is Quartz 2d. Erickson fails to describe stripping out application content from the received legacy window content.

Moreover Erickson appears to conflict with Lyons and Apple Computers. In Lyons, at pg. 1, it appears Cocca uses the AppKit not Quartz 2d. Moreover, in Apple Computers, at pg. 25, it appears Cocca uses Coca drawing routines, which are separate from Quartz 2d. These inconsistencies suggest that the references do not refer to the same version of the operating system. Accordingly, it is improper to use these references to support the anticipation rejection because they do not refer to the same release or product.

Unlike Jaguar, the invention of independent claim 1 requires, among other things, receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in a window corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation; and switching between the CDWM and the DWM to render the advanced application content and legacy application content. Jaguar fails to expressly or inherently describe all elements arranged or combined in the same way as the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 7-11, 15-16, and 19 further define novel features of the invention of amended independent claim 1 and each depend directly, or indirectly, from independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1, dependent claims 7-11, 15-16, and 19 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). As such,

withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of dependent claims 7-11, 15-16, and 19 are respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 44 is a computer operating system that uses a composited desktop rendering model that provides legacy support for applications compatible only with an invalidation desktop rendering model. An instance of a legacy application program providing legacy window information to a legacy desktop window manager (DWM). In turn, client content is stripped from the legacy window information and converted to a raster image. The compositing desktop window manager (CDWM) draws a window to a buffer memory, wherein the CDWM renders the window by applying a texture to a mesh that comprises the raster image of the client content and default non-client information.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to describe, among other things, *an instance of a legacy application program providing legacy window information to a legacy desktop window manager (DWM); stripping out client content from the legacy window information; converting the client content to a raster image of the client content; . . . applying a texture to a mesh, and wherein the texture comprises the raster image of the client content and default non-client information;* as recited in amended independent claim 44. The Office relies upon Jaguar to anticipate the invention of amended independent claim 44. The cited portions describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment.

As discussed above, the references relied on by the Office do not provide a coherent and consistent description of Jaguar. Furthermore, the references fail to describe converting legacy application content to a raster image that is used to texture a mesh created by a compositing window manager. Morgenstern, at pg. 1, explains that the PDF primitives are the

core of Jaguar. Siracusa explains that Quartz Extreme may free up CPU cycles on the processor. However, Morgenstern, Siracusa, and the other references fail to describe rendering legacy application content as the texture of a mesh. Additionally, Morgenstern, Siracusa, and the other references fail to describe the default non-client information that is included in the texture. Nothing in Jaguar describes, among other things, the interaction between a legacy DWM and CDWM to render content in a graphical user interface.

Unlike Jaguar, the invention of amended independent claim 44 requires, among other things, an instance of a legacy application program providing legacy window information to a legacy desktop window manager (DWM); stripping out client content from the legacy window information; converting the client content to a raster image of the client content. Jaguar fails to expressly or inherently describe all elements of the invention arranged or combined in the same way as amended independent claim 44. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of amended independent claim 44.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A) Applicable Authority

Title 35 U.S.C. §103(a) declares, a patent shall not issue when “the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.” The Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere* counseled that an obviousness determination is made by identifying: the scope and content of the prior art; the level of ordinary skill in the prior art; the differences between the claimed invention and prior art references; and secondary considerations. *Graham v. John Deere*

Co., 383 U.S. 1 (1966). To support a finding of obviousness, the initial burden is on the Office to apply the framework outlined in *Graham* and to provide some reason, or suggestions or motivations found either in the prior art references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to produce the claimed invention. See *Application of Bergel*, 292 F. 2d 955, 956-957 (CCPA 1961). Recently, the Supreme Court elaborated, at pages 13-14 of the *KSR* opinion, it will be necessary for [the Office] to look at interrelated teachings of multiple [prior art references]; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by [one of] ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the [patent application].” *KSR v. Teleflex*, No. 04-1350, 550 U.S. ____ (2007).

B) Obviousness Rejections Based on Jaguar.

Claims 21, 27-31, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection because the prior art fails to fairly describe or suggest all elements of independent claim 21.

Independent claim 21 is computer storage configured to perform a method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A composting desktop window manager (CDWM) receives application content from advanced applications in a bottom-to-top order to display the application content received in a bottom-to-top order in windows corresponding to the advanced applications in the graphical user interface. A desktop window manager (DWM) receives application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in windows corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface. Application

content received from the legacy applications are stripped and converted to a graphical representation. The DWM redirects received application content to the CDWM, which renders the advanced application content and legacy application content and displays at least a portion of the application content in an opaque content portion of the windows, where the windows have a translucent frame portions.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in a window corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface, wherein the DWM redirects the application content received to the CDWM; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation;* as recited in independent claim 21.

The Office relies upon Jaguar to render the invention of independent claim 21 unpatentable. The cited portions describe or suggest a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. As discussed above, Apple Computers, Lipton, and Erickson fail to describe or suggest the DWM to the CDWM that render the graphical user interface. Apple Computers fails to describe rendering a window in a graphical user interface. Lipton fails to describe receiving the legacy application content in top-to-bottom order. Erickson fails to describe or suggest stripping out application content from the received legacy window content. Nothing in Jaguar describes or suggests, among other things, redirecting application content from the DWM to the CDWM to render content in a graphical user interface.

Unlike Jaguar, the invention of independent claim 21 requires, among other things, receiving, at a desktop window manager (DWM), application content from legacy

applications in a top-to-bottom order to display the application content received in a top-to-bottom order in a window corresponding to the legacy application in the graphical user interface, wherein the DWM redirects the application content received to the CDWM; stripping out application content received from the legacy applications; converting the stripped application content to a graphical representation. Jaguar fails to expressly or inherently describe or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 21. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 21.

Dependent claims 27-31 and 39 further define novel features of the invention of independent claim 21 and each depend directly, or indirectly, from independent claim 21. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 21, dependent claims 27-31 and 39 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of dependent claims 27-31 and 39 are respectfully requested.

C) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar in view of US Patent Publication No 2003/0107570 (“Solazzi”).

Claims 18 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar in view of Solazzi. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection because the prior art fails to fairly describe or suggest all elements of independent claims 1 and 21.

Claims 18 and 38 depend from independent claims 1 and 21, respectively. As discussed above, Jaguar fails to teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 18 and 38 are patentable over Jaguar for at least the above-cited reasons.

The addition of Solazzi fails to cure the deficiencies of Jaguar with respect to the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allowance of dependent claims 18 and 38.

D) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar and Solazzi in view of Technology Terminology, Mike Whitman, May 13, 2001 (Whitman).

Claims 17 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar, in view of Solazzi, and further in view of Whitman. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection because the prior art fails to fairly teach or suggest all elements of amended independent claims 1 and 21.

Claims 17 and 37 depend from independent claims 1 and 21. As discussed above, Jaguar fails to teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 17 and 37 are patentable over Jaguar for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Solazzi and Whitman fails to cure the deficiencies of Jaguar with respect to the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allowance of dependent claims 17 and 37.

E) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar and Solazzi in view of Technology Terminology, Mike Whitman, May 13, 2001 (Whitman), and US Patent Application No. 2002/0180741 ("Fowler").

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar in view of Solazzi, Whitman, and Fowler.

Independent claim 41 is a computer implemented method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump

mapping, and environmental mapping. Application content to display in a window is received; and at least a portion of the application content is displayed in a content portion of the window having a frame portion, where displaying further comprises rendering spectral highlights on the frame portion based on a virtual light source by the compositing desktop window manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *receiving application content in a window; . . . the compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping*, as recited in amended independent claim 41. The Office relies upon Jaguar, Solazzi, and Whitman to render the invention of claim 41 unpatentable.

The cited portions of Jaguar describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. The cited portions of Solazzi describe reflective properties of 3-D images. The cited portions of Whitman provide term definitions. The cited portion of Fowler describe bump maps for images. However, Fowler fails to describe or suggest a windows manager that provides bump mappings and environmental mappings. Nothing in Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, or Fowler, alone and in combination, describes, or suggests, among other things, receiving application content in a window and a CDWM for providing transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping.

Unlike Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, and Fowler, the invention of independent claim 41 requires, among other things, receiving application content and a compositing desktop window manager that is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping for windows that display the application content. Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, and Fowler, alone and in combination, fail to expressly or inherently describe

or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 41. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 41.

F) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar and Solazzi in view of Technology Terminology, Mike Whitman, May 13, 2001 (Whitman), US Patent Application No. 2002/0180741 (“Fowler”), and US Patent Application No. 2003/0189599 (“Ben-Shachar”).

Claims 42-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar in view of Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, and Ben-Shachar.

Independent claim 42 is a computer implemented method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop window manager receives application content in reverse z-order to display in a window. The compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. At least a portion of the application content is displayed in a content portion of the window having a frame portion, where the displaying further comprises rendering reflective content on the frame portion based on other discrete content separate from the window in the graphical user interface by the compositing desktop window manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a compositing desktop window manager, application content in reverse z-order to display in a window; . . . the compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping*, as recited in independent claim 42. The Office relies

upon Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, and Ben-Shachar to render the invention of independent claim 42 unpatentable.

The cited portions of Jaguar describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. The cited portions of Solazzi describe reflective properties of 3-D images. The cited portions of Whitman provide term definitions. The cited portion of Fowler describe bump maps for images. The cited portion of Ben-Shachar describe sharing application windows that are processed in reverse z-order to display the windows. Ben-Shachar receives a list that include window size, shape, position, and sharing information.

Fowler fails to describe or suggest a windows manager that provides bump mappings and environmental mappings. Moreover, Ben-Schachar fails to describe or suggest a compositing desktop window manager that receives application content in reverse z-order. Nothing in Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, or Ben-Shachar alone and in combination, describes, or suggests, among other things, receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window and a CDWM for providing transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping.

Unlike Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, and Ben-Shachar, the invention of independent claim 42 requires, among other things, receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window at a compositing desktop window manager that is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, or Ben-Shachar, alone and in combination, fails to expressly or inherently describe or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 42. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 42.

Independent claim 43 is a computer implemented method for rendering a desktop window in a graphical user interface of an operating system shell. A compositing desktop window manager receives application content in reverse z-order to display in a window. The compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. At least a portion of the application content is displayed in a content portion of the window having a frame portion, where displaying further comprises rendering refractive content on the frame portion based on other discrete content behind the window in the graphical user interface by the compositing desktop window manager.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *receiving, at a compositing desktop window manager, application content in reverse z-order to display in a window; . . . the compositing desktop window manager is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping*, as recited in independent claim 43.

The Office relies upon Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, and Ben-Schachar to render the invention of independent claim 43 unpatentable. As discussed above, Fowler fails to describe or suggest a windows manager that provides bump mappings and environmental mappings. Moreover, Ben-Schachar fails to describe or suggest a compositing desktop window manager that receives application content in reverse z-order. Nothing in Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, or Ben-Shachar, alone and in combination, describes, or suggests, among other things, receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window and a CDWM for providing transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping.

Unlike Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, or Ben-Shachar, the invention of independent claim 43 requires, among other things, receiving application content in reverse z-order to display in a window at a compositing desktop window manager that is configured to provide transparency, shadows, lighting effects, bump mapping, and environmental mapping. Jaguar, Solazzi, Whitman, Fowler, or Ben-Shachar, alone and in combination, fail to expressly or inherently describe or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 43. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 43.

G) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar and U.S. Patent No. 6,980,209 (Donham).

Claims 2 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar and Donham. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection because the prior art fails to fairly describe or suggest all elements of independent claims 1 and 21.

Claims 2 and 22 depend from independent claims 1 and 21. As discussed above, Jaguar fails to teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 2 and 22 are patentable over Jaguar for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Donham fails to cure the deficiencies of Jaguar with respect to the elements of independent claims 1 and 22. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allowance of dependent claims 2 and 22.

H) Obviousness Rejection Based on Jaguar, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0030997 ("Farrah"), and U.S. Patent No. 4,694,404 (Meagher).

Claims 20, 40, and 45-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaguar, Farrah, and Meagher. Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness

rejection because the prior art fails to fairly describe or suggest all elements of independent claims 1 and 21.

Claims 20 and 40 depend from independent claims 1 and 21. As discussed above, Jaguar fails to teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. Accordingly, claims 20 and 40 are patentable over Jaguar for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Farrah and Meagher fails to cure the deficiencies of Jaguar with respect to the elements of independent claims 1 and 21. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and allowance of dependent claims 20 and 40.

Amended independent claim 45 is a computer-implemented method for resizing a window defined in part by a mesh. The mesh is divided into three regions per mesh dimension. In turn, for each region, maintaining offsets of mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is bounded by a bounding box of the window, and scaling mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is not bounded by the bounding box of the window.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Jaguar, Farrah, and Meagher fails to describe or suggest, among other things, *dividing the mesh into three regions per mesh dimension; for each region, maintaining offsets of mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is bounded by a bounding box of the window, and scaling mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is not bounded by the bounding box of the window*, as recited in amended independent claim 45. The Office relies upon Jaguar, Farrah, and Meagher to render the invention of amended independent claim 45 unpatentable.

The cited portions of Jaguar describe a windows environment and user interaction with the windows environment. The cited portions of Farrah describe generating a grid. The cited portions of Meagher describes generating a 3-D image from a 2-D image. Nothing in

Jaguar, Farrah, or Meagher, alone or in combination, describes or suggests, among other things, dividing the mesh into three regions per mesh dimension to maintain mesh offsets for some regions and to scale mesh vertices in other regions.

Unlike Jaguar, Farrah, or Meagher, the invention of amended independent claim 45 requires, among other things, dividing the mesh into three regions per mesh dimension; for each region, maintaining offsets of mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is bounded by a bounding box of the window, and scaling mesh vertices in any dimension by which the region is not bounded by the bounding box of the window. Jaguar, Farrah, or Meagher, alone or in combination, fail to expressly or inherently teach or suggest all elements of the invention of independent claim 45. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of independent claim 45.

Amended dependent claims 46-48 further define novel features of the invention of amended independent claim 45 and each depend directly from independent claim 45. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 45, dependent claims 46-48 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection and allowance of amended dependent claims 46-48 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/MONPLAISIR HAMILTON/

Monplaisir Hamilton
Reg. No. 54,851

MGH/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550